

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2017 08:44 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	10
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 1: 84.351C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Strengths:

The target population is identified as 78% living in poverty and 99% students of color. The applicant makes the case that access to arts education for these students is not equitable, and in addition, current arts education practices are not relevant to the needs of these students. Arts educators, who have been trained in curriculum that is Eurocentric, are isolated and are often excluded from school-wide PD to update practices. Applicant proposes a PD program specifically for arts educators that meets the needs of teachers to address this diverse, at risk, population by helping them emphasize contemporary "artists who are diverse in gender, race, nationality, medium, and subject (e 25)," and by helping teachers shift from directed instruction, to inquiry-based instruction to place the student at the center of the learning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

This proposal stems from a previous AEMDD project that provided collaborating teaching artists to work in schools using theatre integration strategies. As a professional development program, specifically for visual arts teachers, this new

program uses Richard, Church & Morrison (2011) to support the need for inquiry based learning (e26), Burton, Cranston, Singerman and Mezirow to support a blended model of intensive out of school instruction with learning in the classroom (e24), and Perkins (2015) to inform the design to go “beyond basic skills, beyond traditional disciplines, beyond discrete disciplines, beyond regional practices, and beyond mastering content (e27)” in support of this contemporary model. Due to the collaborative requirement, the program will select schools rather than individual cohorts for participation, all of which have been identified as underrepresented in the previous section. Selection for participation seems inclusive and will be based on the existence of arts teachers, need, and capacity to fulfill requirements. At the beginning, applicant proposes to include one arts specialist from each of 20 selected participant schools. Initial surveys from participating school personnel that include perceptions, practices, knowledge of contemporary arts, teacher challenges and needs, will be used as a baseline and to design the PD. (e33) The training of teachers and project leaders will begin in the first year to build capacity. Intensity begins immediately in year one, as contemporary teaching artists begin working with collaborating arts educators, gaining information about components of curriculum in action, and discovering best way to support them. Two workshops within this first year prepare collaborating educators to personalize their activities beginning in year two. Including school leaders in training supports teacher efforts and enhances school wide perception of value. Leaders are expected to offer additional support with time and resources. Each year includes a student exhibition, serving as a tangible goal, and a way to share with the community. The program is scaled, adding intensity through the addition of more collaborating classroom teachers in years three and four, to support the interdisciplinary knowledge and practice of the arts specialists. Arts teachers will begin leading segments of PD in year 3 taking on a leadership role in their schools. They will also share what they have learned with the full school community once a year, creating visibility for the arts specialists as valuable resources. This building and broadening of the program is carefully planned to increase opportunities for whole school impact.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

Project staff is “representative of the population served, diverse in race, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, and age (e25).” School administrator leadership shows strength through experience and support for the arts. The superintendent has “committed significant resources to the arts” and contributed to “Artful Learning Communities I: Assessing Learning in the Arts.” (e25). The Field Support Liaison has been principal of a participating school during the AEMDD project. Project staff is experienced in the arts, as well as in leadership, research, program development, and previous arts education initiatives (e26-28). Consultants are numerous and well qualified within varied partner organizations. Dr. Rob Horowitz is the Associate Director for the Center for Arts Education Research and will lead a team of senior and post doctoral researchers for this project. The United Federation for Teachers will be a partner in support of program development as well as support for the use of digital technologies and the School of Visual Arts will consult in contemporary visual arts teaching practice (e 49-52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Numerous personnel are involved in this project and are well qualified to undertake listed responsibilities. Top leadership in school district have oversight and will align their activities at no extra cost to the program. Time commitments specifically from the Director of Teaching and Learning (18%-15%), Associate Director of Teaching and Learning (2.5-3.5 days per week), the Project Coordinators (two people at 25%-28% each, and the Project Assistant (8-10 hours per week) should provide the time needed for quality oversight (e34). Collaborating Teaching Artists from CAE will give direct support to the teachers. The first year activities go beyond simple planning and begin building capacity through immediate training. Adding more classroom teachers to teams in years 3 & 4 increases interdisciplinary opportunities, working toward stated objective to build more effective and collaborative arts specialists.

Weaknesses:

Whereas activities and milestones are listed for each year, specific times are lacking for most, making it difficult to determine how feedback might be used for continuous improvement. There is no explanation to clarify what "regular check ins" and "ongoing planning" and "ongoing data collection, analysis, and reporting" means in regard to frequency (E58-59). The time commitment for the principal evaluator is not included here.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

Strengths:

The independent evaluator has extensive experience evaluating arts based projects and is assisted by a highly-qualified team. The applicant's model includes impact study, mixed method study, and implementation study aligned with stated

objectives. Controls are in place for grade level, subject and classroom. Research questions have been developed and are included (e 61). Performance data will be gathered through a mixed-method study, and will include quantitative and qualitative approaches. Team will be using the Classroom Assessment of Learning and Teaching (CALT) as observation protocol. Platform for analysis is an “easy to use, transparent platform designed to maximize teacher responses and log ongoing digital reflection of acquired knowledge and practice” (Horowitz and Horowitz, 2016) (e42). By using Dr. Horowitz as the principal evaluator, the school system will be able to take advantage of his established research methods based on strong theory that he developed for USDOE and related arts education initiatives.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology

1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:

(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students’ and educators’ access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.

(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.

Strengths:

The use of digital technology and media is integral to their program, used to model, practice, accomplish onsite collaboration, perform peer exchanges, and disseminate artwork. Four innovative apps are given as examples for developing technological literacy. Digital documentation provides opportunities to track learning process.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2017 08:44 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 09:32 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	8
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	22
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	24
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	3
Total	105	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 1: 84.351C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Strengths:

(1) The Future Arts Initiative (FAI) will expand elementary and middle school visual arts and classroom teachers' capacities to provide high quality contemporary arts education and improve student outcomes for thousands of students in New York City School District 29. District 29, located in northeast Queens, serves an extremely diverse, high-need, high-poverty student population, the majority of whom qualify for free or reduced price lunch, are eligible for Human Resources Administration benefits, or are enrolled in a Universal Meal School. In the 2015-16 school year, 78% of students were identified as living in poverty. The district served 28,007 students, 21,355 of whom were in grades K-8, 16% were identified as students with disabilities, and 5.0% were considered English language learners (72% of students in District 29 are Black; 11% are Asian, 12% Hispanic, 1% White, and 3% identify as Other) (p. e22).

(2) Salient features of the proposed PDAE initiative, that address gaps, weaknesses and needs, are described as follows: contemporary artworks and performances are incorporated in the curriculum, emphasizing artists who are diverse in gender, race, nationality, medium, and subject, and who reflect and are culturally relevant to the multicultural student population, investigations incorporate research-based art practices, and develop interdisciplinary understanding by addressing themes, issues and concerns across content areas, digital media and technology are incorporated throughout the four-year program as a means of creating, documenting, presenting, and assessing original work, collaborative art projects will communicate social concerns and issues relevant to the school/student community. Multicultural Contemporary Art and Artists are also an integral part of the proposed work. D29's diverse student population calls for a visual arts curriculum that is culturally responsive and which includes artists and artworks that reflect the experiences and backgrounds of the students.

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant identified previous arts education projects as foundational work upon which the current work will be built; however, results of past programming that serve as this foundation were not provided.

(2) No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

1) 1) The applicant cites current work built on past AEMDD studies, including, the Arts Engage Initiative (of which I. S/P.S. 268 in District 29 participated), whereby social studies teachers worked with theatre teaching artists (TAs) across a four-year period. Teachers who collaborated with TAs were able to develop high-quality arts integrated teaching and student assessment methods, and became reflective practitioners adept at documenting, interpreting, and assessing “arts plus arts integration” learning across ELA and social studies disciplines with consideration and strategies in place to include eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

2) Future Arts Initiative (FAI) takes a comprehensive approach based on past research documenting the success of the proposed implementation plan, which includes: : 1) full-day, district-wide professional development (PD) workshops and smaller, in-cohort PD sessions; 2) collaborating teaching artists' (CTAs) in-class support; 3) classroom observations; 4) online and follow-up assignments between workshops; and 5) network meetings for school leaders. FAI targets District 29 elementary and middle schools with either a certified visual arts teacher or a visual arts cluster teacher (elementary school teachers who usually teach classes in art, music, science, or physical-education and are not assigned to the same group of students for the entire day). Based on this plan, there is a strong likelihood that the proposed program will have a large impact on the target population.

3) An extremely detailed roll-out of programmatic elements was provided on p. e35-40, documenting such aspects as school selection based on need in Year 1, and the art and other teacher collaboration sessions that will occur in Year 3. Duration and intensity were well-documented through a detailed description of such program components as: number and timing of classroom observations, online and follow-up assignments between workshops, frequency and duration of Professional Development sessions.

Weaknesses:

- 1) No research was offered to support the design of the PD based on existing studies.
- 2) No weaknesses were identified.
- 3) No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant provided extensive information on relevant training and experience of key project personnel that indicate the qualifications will support the goals of the proposed project. For example, the key three positions are filled by individuals who have led CAE's long partnerships with the Teachers Center and the Council of Supervisors and Administrators to provide PD to school leaders, classroom teachers and arts educators. They have also led a six-year partnership with the NYCDOE Office of English Language Learners, devising and facilitating PD for classroom teachers who partner with teaching artists to deliver arts-integrated instruction to thousands of students through an intensive summer school program and academic year Saturday program, as well as overseeing two of CAE's AEMDD research grants. The Deputy Director, has been with CAE since 2008 and has managed the drafting and submission of CAE's three USDOE AEMDD grants. She has worked with the Teaching and Learning, and finance teams on grant implementation, reporting, and budget management. Earlier in her career, the Deputy Director worked as a teaching artist and a licensed dance teacher. She has an MA in Arts Administration from New York University.

(2) The qualifications of the project consultants and subcontractors are well-aligned to the goals and objectives of the project, including the project external evaluator, and arts liaison, and professional development resource center (e49-50).

Weaknesses:

- (1) No weaknesses were identified.
- (2) No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(1) The management plan addresses internal and external roles, and the organized use of human and other resources to ensure execution, monitoring, controls, and course adjustments of the project. A timeline overview and project components are also addressed. (FAI components and activities are listed and detailed in the project services section; and activities and correlating short and long term outcomes are detailed in the appendix.

(2) On p. e57, the applicant outlines a specific workplan that includes regular check-in between D29 and CAE project staff (via phone and in-person), weekly CAE team meetings (September through June, bi-weekly in the summer), ongoing planning with PD consultants and presenters, ongoing data collection, analysis, and reporting, which will be sufficient and appropriate in the efforts to carry out the objectives of the project.

(3) Sufficient time commitments of key personnel were adequately described and will be sufficient to carry out the

objectives of the project.

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses were identified.
- 2) The applicant did not provide procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed budget. For example, if the interim results revealed a need for mid-course correction or a change in program implementation, no clear plan for how this would take place was offered.
- 3). No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: **15**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

- (1) Mixed-method analysis will investigate causal relationships among implementation, professional development, instructional, and teacher knowledge variables. Regression analysis will determine the best predictors (among implementation and teachers' professional development variables) for changes in teaching skills. Systematic qualitative analysis using NVIVO software will seek to triangulate data from different types of participants and sites, identifying common or contradictory patterns, to help refine and validate the causal model, as well as provide qualitative data for ongoing formative assessment.
- (2) A hierarchical fidelity measure will be developed based upon the project's logic model and management plan. The evaluation team will follow the fidelity measure guidelines employed in their i3 evaluation with USDOE technical assistance. All implementation components, such as full-day professional development (PD) workshops, PD follow-up projects, classroom teaching artist (CTA) support, communication with CTA between sessions, collaboration with classroom teachers, presentation at staff PD, program observations (as opposed to evaluator observations), and preparation of student exhibitions will be assigned a score at three levels: classroom/teacher, school site, and program.
- (3) The logic model helped to provide specific theory.

Weaknesses:

- (1) The applicant did identify the number of schools that will be included in the analysis; however, a discussion of power analyses to determine sample size, which indicates number of participants, in order to determine appropriate effect size was not offered.
- (2) A fidelity measure is proposed for development by the applicant. However, fidelity unless otherwise noted, refers to the implementation of the intervention. Details of how this measure would provide timely feedback to allow for mid-course correction was not made evident.
- (3) Additional theory was needed.

Reader's Score: 24

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology

1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:

- (a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.
- (b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.

Strengths:

- a) High speed internet access will grant access to open educational resources.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/01/2017 09:32 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 07:05 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	8
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	21
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 1: 84.351C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: NYCDOE Community School District 29 (U351C170009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Strengths:

1.The applicant provided appropriate information and data that focus on serving disadvantaged students. The Future Arts Initiative (FAI) provide arts education to a student population that consists of 36 schools where 80% of the students are living in poverty (e72), There is also the need for providing professional development (PD) that supports contemporary art practices, related technologies, and the demands of 21st century education (e23). There are situations when art teachers are excluded from school wide professional development.

2.There is a gap in the arts as it relates to presenting contemporary artworks and artists that are diverse and relevant to a multicultural student population. There are gaps and the approach in the art classes should include incorporating art across the content areas, presenting original work by incorporating digital media and technology and promoting art that raises social issues relevant to the community (e25). There is an appropriate and effective list with explanations that addresses the gaps in the art programs which are including multicultural contemporary art and artists, research-based, interdisciplinary inquiry across subjects, using digital media and technology tools, and elevating the status of the arts and arts teachers. These are detailed and include examples on the process for implementation in the schools (e30).

Weaknesses:

1.The applicant provided limited data for the 36 schools that will be involved in the project. There was data presented for each of the buildings but no averages were presented to demonstrate the high need for arts in the schools. It would be beneficial to have data on the number of art teachers and the type of art classes provided to students. The proposal identified solutions to the issues but did not express or highlight the critical gaps and issues with supporting data.

2.No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

1.The research is based on a current project - The Center for Arts Education (CAE) Arts Engage Initiative (AEI), which improves the students' math and ELA scores. The teachers and teaching artists also had positive outcomes and increase student engagement (e42). The project will adopt the positive elements of the CAE AEI program and incorporate these into this project.

2.The applicant indicated that professional development (PD), which is based on solid and substantial research, will be provided in a unique and comprehensive manner which will include a full day district wide PD and smaller PD sessions; in class support by the collaborating teaching artists (CTAs); classroom observations; online assignments at the completion of the workshops, and meetings of the school leaders in the network (e31). Supplies such as a high definition digital camera will be disbursed to FAI participants. There is also a description on how the project will address the creative process and practices defined by the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCAS). (e43) There are eight elements included in the process and each has a description on how it will be applied in the project such as "responding" where FAI participants will research and reflect on a range of contemporary art and artists, and apply what they have learned in their classrooms and schools. (e44) The impact of the PD will be for teachers to have a solid understanding of contemporary art practices and devised and led at least two interdisciplinary units of study. Students will also develop critical thinking skills for the 21st Century. The district will provide services to participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. As indicated in the proposal, the community is diverse and the project will serve a racially, culturally, and economically diverse district consisting of multiple Title I schools, a significant number of English Learners and students with disabilities.

3.There will be two PD workshops that will introduce visual art teachers to the project. The workshops will provide an opportunity to plan for the next year of the project and to share an understanding of the inquiry approach using technology and contemporary art practice. (e35) Each teacher will participate in 54-78 hours of direct PD. There is intensity, duration, and quality mentioned in the narrative as it relates to the PD as an example the number of hours that will involve PD which is sufficient and appropriate for the successful implementation of a quality project with the teachers and students.

Weaknesses:

1.The research and up-to-date knowledge presented in the narrative was limited and did not focus on the services that will be provided to the staff. Research on PD and content would have enhanced the proposal and provided additional support for the project.

2.No weaknesses noted

3.No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

1. The key project personnel include a list of central office staff, coordinators and assistants listed in the narrative. The following staff will be in-kind and includes the Acting Superintendent, Field Support Liaison, and Teacher Development and Evaluation Coach. The descriptions in the narrative for each person includes extensive experiences and skills to the positions and also to support the project efforts. The Director of Teaching and Learning (15% of time on the project), Associate Director of Teaching and Learning (2.5-3.5 days per week), Deputy Director (4% time), Project Assistant (8-10 hours per week), and Collaborating Teaching Artists (CTAs) (6 visits to each school at 3 hours per visit). Each position includes the description of the project involvement and support that will be provided.

2. The Associate Director of the Center for Arts Education Research at Teachers College, Columbia University will be contracted to conduct the evaluation of the project. The Associate Director will be the lead evaluator and he has extensive experience in the design of evaluation studies and will use senior graduate and post-doctorate researchers to support the effort. The United Federation of Teachers -Teacher Center (UFT-TC) will provide PD on digital technologies and platforms in teaching practices. Additional individuals are identified that will support the PD effort of the project. These include the Instruction Technology Specialist, Field Staff Specialist, School of Visual Arts (SVA) staff, staff of Art21, Joy2Learn, Arts Specialists and Cluster Teachers, and NCheng Partners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. The D29 leadership and members of the Center for Arts Education (CAE) experienced staff along with the project consultants will implement the project components and activities. There are staff members in D29 that visit schools on a regular basis and the CAE has 12 full-time and 4 part-time staff members to support the project. (e53) A list of activities is included in the proposal for each project yearly cycle. The applicant did describe with solid details the major components and elements of the project such as in year 1 there will be the selection of schools, development of surveys, conduct interviews and classroom observations. The descriptions for these components are specific and provide sufficient details. The proposal also lists the major activities for Years 2, 3, and 4. It appears that the project can accomplish the outcomes in a timely manner and within the budget described in the proposal.

2. No strengths noted

3. The applicant indicated that the time commitment for each staff person is appropriate in order to meet the project outcomes. There appears to be sufficient staff proposed for the project with a appropriate amount of time to ensure

successful management and implementation of the project.

Weaknesses:

1. There is limited information on the timeline and the specific dates for accomplishing the various activities and components identified in the proposal. Most are listed during one of the project years but are not very specific outlining who is responsible for the task and the outcomes.
2. The applicant did not respond to ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
3. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

Strengths:

1. The applicants provide a well-designed quasi-experimental evaluation design and impact study in which they describe how the proposed project will be evaluated. They include quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis, an impact study, fidelity of the implementation, and achievement of the performance objectives (e60). The applicant discussed the details of the impact study and the steps and procedures for determining the outcomes and results of this study. There will also be a mixed method study that includes the Classroom Assessment of Learning and Teaching (CALT) observational protocol for investigating teacher application of knowledge which provides detailed quantitative and qualitative data on program goals. Additional instruments will be used to gather data for analysis to determine the relationships among various variables such as professional development, instructional, and teacher knowledge (e63). The data will be collected using the ArtsResearch data collection and analysis software platform.

2. There will be quarterly meetings to discuss the results of the implementation of the PD and various other activities. The discussions will focus on responding to a set of questions included in the proposal (e65) such as the most effective program components and the steps for improvement. There are three additional questions to assist in the performance feedback of the project activities and progress towards achieving the outcomes. The success and areas for improvement will be discussed to determine next steps. Various reports during the year and yearly reports will be issued by the evaluator on the progress of the project.

3. The applicant included a logic model that described the participants, short term outcomes, and long term outcomes. The outcomes focused on the different target groups in the project such as the art teachers, collaborating teaching artists and other staff involved in the project. The applicant included the research which demonstrated strong support for incorporating contemporary artworks and art practices into the visual arts curriculum through the application of project-based learning, digital media and technology, and collaborative artmaking and other strategies (e66).

Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. Quarterly meetings discussing the project outcomes are insufficient in raising issues and concerns. If there are concerns with the progress of the project, frequent meetings, at least monthly, should be conducted to discuss the issues and design steps for solving these concerns to ensure the project is accomplishing the tasks in a timely and efficient manner. Waiting to solve problems on a quarterly basis can sometimes create additional issues with the project and cause greater problems and concerns in trying to accomplish the outcomes.

Reader's Score: 26

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology****1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.

(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.

Strengths:

The applicant will implement technology (iPads) for each student and staff members and provide PD on using digital technology in the classroom to create, promote and assess original art work.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 07:05 PM